



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/646,869 | 08/25/2003 | Kang-heuy Lee | 1293.1837 | 1669 |
| 21171 | 7590 | 02/12/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | BODDIE, WILLIAM | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 2629 | | |
| | | MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | 02/12/2008 | | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/646,869

Applicant(s)

LEE, KANG-HEUY

Examiner

William L. Boddie

Art Unit

2629

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE *Seeart*: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-6, 8-17, 19-23 and 27.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.



ALEXANDER EISEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed claim amendments significantly alter the scope of the dependent claims which did not previously contain limitations concerning ignoring remote control signals and/or on-screen-display processors. As the proposed claim amendment would alter the scope of the dependent claims the amendments will not be entered, and further search and reconsideration would be required.

As to the Applicant's arguments that the Bradley reference is structurally different from the claimed invention and that Bradley teaches away from the claimed invention, the Examiner must respectfully disagree. It is important to note that the Bradley reference is not required to be structurally identical to the Applicant's invention. The Applicant cites numerous passages of Bradley apparently to illustrate that there is additional complexity in the Bradley device not present in the Applicant's invention. Regardless of how complex Bradley is, all that is required by the current claims structurally is, for example, an apparatus for controlling functions of an image processing apparatus using a remote control. There are no limitations limiting the over all system to a single processor, for example. Therefore, the additional complexity of the Bradley reference is not seen as removing it as a valid reference. Furthermore the Applicant has failed to show why Bradley teaches away from the claimed invention. The Applicant cited numerous passages from Bradley, none of which contradict limitations found in the claims. Furthermore the Applicant has neglected to incorporate the passage previously cited by the Examiner which states, "For example, if a "play" command is issued to a system with a television set 12 and a video cassette recorder as the television appliance 14, the television set 12 will not understand the signal and will ignore it" (col. 13, lines 61-65). This passage is seen as sufficiently disclosing the limitation of claims 22-23 and 25. Therefore for the reasons stated above the rejections are seen as proper and are thus maintained.